

COMMENT ON THE REQUEST FOR ACTION ON THE NAME *VOLUTA MITRA* LINNAEUS, 1758 (GASTROPODA). Z.N.(S.) 1728
(see volume 22, pages 355–356)

By Harald A. Rehder (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

I have read the proposal of Dr. Eugene Coan with interest since I am at the moment critically studying the marine mollusca of Polynesia, of which the species under discussion forms a conspicuous element.

At the outset I must point out that alternative (B), as outlined by Coan, cannot be entertained by the Commission since *Voluta mitra* Linnaeus is, in my opinion, not a nomen dubium, since it covers both varieties—*episcopalis* and *papalis*, and must be restricted to one or the other of these varieties as a synonym.

It is my conviction that we should follow Linnaeus' later judgement, as expressed in the *Museum Ludovicae Ulricaе*, 1764, and the twelfth edition of the *Systema Naturae*, 1767, and consider *Voluta mitra* a distinct species, and the trivial names *episcopalis* and *papalis* as denoting varieties, the former being the nominal form. I agree with Dodge (1955, *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 107 : 121–123) in this particular.

Coan's statement that most authors have abandoned the use of *Voluta mitra* is correct as far as concerns works published in the last century and in the early part of the twentieth century. But it is not true if one considers recent workers. I have gone through rather carefully publications that have appeared in the last twenty-five years, and have found only one in which *Mitra episcopalis* is used; this is the *Handbuch der Palaeozoologie*, Band 6: Gastropoda, Teil 6, 1943 by Wenz, who apparently followed Thiele (1931, *Handbuch Syst. Weichtierk.* 1 : 340). All the other works consulted, twelve in all, published in the years 1941–65, use *Mitra mitra*. And these include many widely used handbooks and manuals. It is apparent, therefore, that the combination *Mitra mitra* (Linnaeus) has come into general use by most professional and amateur malacologists in the last decades, and to return to *Mitra episcopalis* (Linnaeus) would create more confusion than stability.

I, therefore, request that the International Commission take the following action:

- (1) Suppress the varietal name *episcopalis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Voluta mitra episcopalis* for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.
- (2) Place the specific name *mitra* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Voluta mitra*, and *papalis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Voluta mitra papalis*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (3) Place the specific name *episcopalis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Voluta mitra episcopalis* on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

By Myra Keen (Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.)

It is my conviction that the request by Eugene Coan is in the interests of stability in that the usage of the combination *Mitra episcopalis* was consistent until very recent years, and the adoption of *Mitra mitra* by later authors has been by no means unanimous.

COMMENT ON PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS FOUR RICHARDSON FISH NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1740

By W. L. Chan (Fisheries Research Station, Hong Kong)

(see present volume, pages 62–64)

I support in principle the application made by Whitehead (1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 23 (1) : 62–64) to suppress four fish names proposed by Richardson (1846, *Rept. Fish. Seas China Japan*). In addition, application is made here to suppress for the same reasons a fifth Richardson fish name, *Clupea flosmaris*.

2. While agreeing with Whitehead that the four names should be suppressed, I would like to add some comments on the identity of the three clupeid species involved, based on a knowledge of Chinese vernacular names used in Hong Kong waters. The Chinese names are written below each of the Reeves illustrations of the three clupeid fishes and are recorded by Richardson (*loc. cit.*). These names are still used by Hong Kong fishermen, but not for the species indicated by Whitehead (1966, *Bull. Brit. Mus. nat. Hist. Zool.*, 14(2) : 15-54). But, although my identifications differ from those of Whitehead, each Richardson name still pre-dates a name which is commonly used in the literature; I therefore agree with Whitehead that the Richardson names should be suppressed.

3. The identity of the Richardson species can be commented on briefly.

(i) *Clupea isingleena* Richardson, 1846. Whitehead (*loc. cit.*) identified the holotype as *Sardinella fimbriata* (Valenciennes, 1847). I have shown elsewhere (Chan, 1965, *Jap. J. Ichthyol.*, 13 : 1-39 and figs. 7a, 8a and b) that the scales of the holotype differ from those of *S. fimbriata*; they more nearly resemble those of *Sardinella brachysoma* Bleeker, 1852. Moreover, the Reeves drawing (No. 60), which Richardson identified with his *C. isingleena*, bears a Chinese ideogram which can be rendered as *Tsing-lun*, i.e. green scale, a name which is nowadays applied to specimens of *S. brachysoma* in Hong Kong waters. The Reeves illustration itself bears a very close likeness to the "*hypselosoma*" form of *Sardinella brachysoma*. However, Bleeker's name *brachysoma* is as firmly entrenched in the literature as Valenciennes' name *fimbriata*, whereas Richardson's name *isingleena* is a *nomen oblitum*. In the interests of stability, Richardson's name should be suppressed, whatever the true identity of the species.

(ii) *Clupea nymphaea* Richardson, 1846. Identified by Whitehead as *Sardinella aurita* Valenciennes, 1846, on the basis of Richardson's description and the Reeves' illustration (No. A 25), the type now being lost. The fish is entitled *Cheung-yiu Lun*, i.e. long-waisted scale, both in the illustration and in the text by Richardson. This name is nowadays applied to specimens of *Sardinella jussieu* (Lacépède, 1803), i.e. *S. gibbosa* (Bleeker, 1849) of some authors. Richardson (*loc. cit.*) gives a pelvic fin ray count of 9 for *Clupea nymphaea*, which is characteristic of *S. aurita* (8 only in *S. jussieu*). Thus, there is no certainty that the Reeves illustration refers to the same species as the Richardson text. Once again, I support Whitehead's application to suppress the Richardson name, which has been constantly misapplied in the literature.

(iii) *Clupea caeruleovittata* Richardson, 1846. There is no type specimen, only a Reeves illustration (No. 59), which Whitehead (*loc. cit.*) identified as probably *Sardinella leiogaster* Valenciennes, 1847. The Reeves illustration is labelled *Wong-tsark*, i.e. golden hue, a name which is nowadays definitely applied to *Sardinella aurita* Valenciennes, 1847. The figure is not inconsistent with that species. Richardson's name, which is in any case a *nomen oblitum*, should be suppressed, whatever the true identity of the species, since the names *aurita* and *leiogaster* are both widely used in the literature.

(iv) *Anguilla clathrata* Richardson, 1846. I support Whitehead's application for the suppression of this *nomen oblitum*, which is otherwise a senior synonym of the well-known Japanese freshwater eel, *Anguilla japonica* Temminck & Schlegel, 1846.

4. *Clupea flosmaris* Richardson, 1846 was based solely on a Reeves illustration (No. 64), labelled with the Chinese name *Hoi-hor*, i.e. sea lily. This species was identified by Whitehead (*loc. cit.*) as possibly a member of either *Herklotsichthys* or *Sardinella*. But this Chinese name nowadays definitely refers to the round herring *Dussumieria acuta* Valenciennes, 1847 and the illustration is consistent with a small specimen of this species. Richardson's name is a *nomen oblitum* and should be suppressed.

5. (i) Application is made to the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the following name for the purposes of the

Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

Clupea flos-maris Richardson, 1847.

(ii) The Commission is requested to place the following name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:

flos-maris Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea flos-maris*.

(iii) The Commission is requested to place the following name on the Official List of Specific names in Zoology:

acuta Valenciennes, 1847, as published in the binomen *Dussumieria acuta*.